

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/734,808	12/12/2000	Carolyn Ramsey Catan	US 000377	2094	
24737	7590 12/01/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			BASHORE, ALAIN L		
P.O. BOX 30 BRIARCLIF	MANOR, NY 10510 ART UNIT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3624		
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003	DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	*
_•	- Advisory Action	09/734,808	RAMSEY CATAN, CAROLYN	1
المعرضي المنافق	Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Alain L. Bashore	3624	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
There final recondition	REPLY FILED 19 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAC fore, further action by the applicant is required to ave ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 tion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea ination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment whic I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in	
_	<b>_</b>	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
fee have fee und (2) as s	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Itensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The rebeen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ler 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officialed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPE R 1.136(a) and the appropriate ext bunt of the fee. The appropriate ex originally set in the final Office acti	P ension tension on; or
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
,	) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);	
•	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	College of the control of the college of the colleg	41
·	<ul> <li>they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	., .		tne
(d	) \(\sum_\) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.	
	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendm	ient
5.	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place t	he
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly	
7.🛛	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • • • •		
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
	Claim(s) allowed:			
	Claim(s) objected to:			
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-11 and 13-16</u> .			
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.	The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
_	Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
. ۲۰			Olaw Halu Alain L. Bashore	



Continuation of 2.

Note:

The amendment to the specification has not been entered because it refers to amending a published patent application.

Regarding arguments made of record:

It would have been further obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine using local bio-authentication information of Harada et al because Harada et teaches such for privacy purposes (col 3, lines 10-12) and non-eligible user participation (col 3, lines 40-42).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano et al to include local sub-credit limit determination because Harada et al teaches local determination of user as important because personal information must be controlled (col 3, lines 8-9) and since Nakano teaches credit sub-limits which is a type of personal information.

HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER